

On the quasi-ergodic distribution of absorbing Markov processes

Guoman He*, Hanjun Zhang†, Yixia Zhu‡

Abstract

In this paper, we give a sufficient condition for the existence and uniqueness of a quasi-ergodic distribution for absorbing Markov processes. We also show that the unique quasi-ergodic distribution is stochastically larger than the unique quasi-stationary distribution in the sense of monotone likelihood-ratio ordering for the process. Using an orthogonal-polynomial approach, we prove that these results are valid for the birth-death process on the nonnegative integers with 0 an absorbing boundary and ∞ an entrance boundary. Moreover, we give an alternative proof of eigentime identity for the birth-death process with exit boundary.

Keywords: Process with absorption; quasi-ergodic distribution; quasi-stationary distribution; eigentime identity; birth-death process

2010 MSC: Primary 60J25; Secondary 37A30, 60J80, 47A75

1 Introduction

Consider a time-homogeneous strong Markov process $X = (X_t, t \geq 0)$ taking values in $E \cup \{\partial\}$, endowed with some countably generated σ -algebra $\mathcal{E}$, where $\partial \notin E$ is a cemetery state. Assume that X has a finite lifetime T , i.e., for $x \in E$, $\mathbb{P}_x(T < \infty) = 1$, where $T = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = \partial\}$. Let $\mathbb{P}_x$ and $\mathbb{E}_x$ stand for the probability and the expectation, respectively, associated with X when initiated from x . The main purpose of this work is to study the existence and uniqueness of a quasi-ergodic distribution for an absorbing Markov process, and give a comparison between the quasi-ergodic distribution and the quasi-stationary distribution for the process.

*School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Xiangtan University, Hunan 411105, P. R. China. Email address: hgm0164@163.com

†School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Xiangtan University, Hunan 411105, P. R. China. Email address: hjz001@xtu.edu.cn

‡School of Mathematics and Computational Science, Xiangtan University, Hunan 411105, P. R. China. Email address: zhuyixia62@163.com

A probability measure ν on E is called a *quasi-stationary distribution* if, for all $t \geq 0$ and any Borel subset A of E ,

$$\mathbb{P}_\nu(X_t \in A | T > t) = \nu(A).$$

Quasi-stationary distribution for a killed Markov process has been studied by various authors since 1940s. On this topic, we refer the reader to survey papers [16, 20] and the book [7] for the background and more informations.

A probability measure m on E is called a *quasi-ergodic distribution* if, for all $t > 0$, every bounded measurable function f and every $x \in E$, the following limit exists:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x\left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X_s) ds | T > t\right) = \int_E f dm.$$

We remark that the above limiting law of the time-average, which we called quasi-ergodic distribution, comes from the paper [2], where the authors proved initially a conditioned version of the ergodic theorem for Markov processes. Under some mild conditions, Chen and Deng [4] showed that a quasi-ergodic distribution can be characterized by the Donsker-Varadhan rate functional which is typically used as the large deviation rate function for Markov processes. Recently, many authors have extensively studied the quasi-ergodic distribution; see [5, 11, 22] for example.

Quasi-ergodic distribution, also called mean-ratio quasi-stationary distribution, is quite different from quasi-stationary distribution (see, e.g., [5, 11, 22]). A natural question is whether there is a relationship between them? As far as we know, it seems that, up to now, no one has given a comparison between the quasi-ergodic distribution and the quasi-stationary distribution. In this paper, we plan to fill this gap and give a comparison between them for the absorbing Markov process, who admits a unique quasi-ergodic distribution and a unique quasi-stationary distribution. We show that the unique quasi-ergodic distribution is stochastically larger than the unique quasi-stationary distribution in the sense of monotone likelihood-ratio ordering (see, e.g., [21]) for the process.

In this work, we first prove that, under suitable assumptions, there exists a unique quasi-ergodic distribution for the absorbing Markov process. In order to illustrate the previous results, we then consider a birth-death process on the nonnegative integers with 0 as an absorbing state and ∞ as an entrance boundary. Based on orthogonal polynomials techniques of [13], we show that these results are valid for the birth-death process. Moreover, using a duality method, we can give another new proof of eigentime identity for the birth-death process with exit boundary.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The main result and its proof are presented in Section 2. In Section 3 we study the case of birth-death processes. We conclude in Section 4 with an example.

2 The main result

In this paper, our main goal is to prove that Assumption (A) below is a sufficient criterion for the existence of a unique quasi-ergodic distribution for an absorbing Markov process. We point out that, for general, almost surely absorbed Markov processes, Assumption (A) is a necessary and sufficient condition for exponential convergence to a unique quasi-stationary distribution in the total variation norm (see [3, Theorem 2.1]).

Assumption (A) There exists a probability measure ν_1 on E such that

(A1) there exists $t_0, c_1 > 0$ such that for all $x \in E$,

$$\mathbb{P}_x(X_{t_0} \in \cdot | T > t_0) \geq c_1 \nu_1(\cdot);$$

(A2) there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for all $x \in E$ and $t \geq 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\nu_1}(T > t) \geq c_2 \mathbb{P}_x(T > t).$$

In order to let the reader have a better understanding of Assumption (A), its specific meaning (see [3]) is restated here: When E is a Polish space, Assumption (A1) implies that X comes back fast in compact sets from any initial conditions; Assumption (A2) means that the highest non-absorption probability among all initial points in E has the same order of magnitude as the non-absorption probability starting from distribution ν_1 .

According to [3, Proposition 2.3], we know that Assumption (A) implied that there exists a non-negative function η on $E \cup \{\partial\}$, positive on E and vanishing on ∂ , defined by

$$\eta(x) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t), \quad (2.1)$$

where the convergence holds for the uniform norm on $E \cup \{\partial\}$ and $\lambda > 0$.

For two probability vectors $\rho = (\rho(i), i \in E)$ and $\rho' = (\rho'(i), i \in E)$, we put $\rho' \lesssim \rho$ and said that ρ' is stochastically smaller than ρ in the sense of monotone likelihood-ratio ordering if and only if $(\rho(i)/\rho'(i), i \in E)$ is increasing.

The following theorem is our main result.

Theorem 2.1. *Assumption (A) implied that there exists a unique quasi-ergodic distribution*

$$m(dx) = \eta(x)\nu(dx)$$

for the process X . In particular, m is just the unique stationary distribution of the h -process (the process conditioned to never be absorbed). Moreover, $\nu \lesssim m$, where ν is the unique quasi-stationary distribution of X .

Proof. (i) We know from [3, Proposition 2.3] that $\int_E \eta(x) \nu(dx) = 1$. Thus, m is a probability distribution on E . Next, we first assume that f is positive and bounded. For fixed u , we set

$$h_u(x) = \inf\{e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t) / \eta(x) : t \geq u\}.$$

From (2.1), we can see that $h_u(x) \uparrow 1$, as $u \rightarrow \infty$. Let $0 < q < 1$. When $(1 - q)t \geq u$, by the Markov property, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}) | T > t) &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}), T > t)}{\mathbb{P}_x(T > t)} \\ &= \frac{\mathbb{E}_x[f(X_{qt}) \mathbf{1}_{\{T > qt\}}] \mathbb{P}_{X_{qt}}(T > (1 - q)t)}{\mathbb{P}_x(T > t)} \\ &= \frac{e^{\lambda qt} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_{qt}) \mathbf{1}_{\{T > qt\}}] e^{\lambda(1-q)t} \mathbb{P}_{X_{qt}}(T > (1 - q)t)}{e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t)} \\ &\geq \frac{e^{\lambda qt} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_{qt}) h_u(X_{qt}) \eta(X_{qt}) \mathbf{1}_{\{T > qt\}}]}{e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t)}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_A$ is the indicator function of A .

From [3, Proposition 2.3], we know that η is bounded. So we get

$$|f(x) h_u(x) \eta(x)| \leq |f(x) e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t)| \leq \|f\|_\infty \|\eta\|_\infty.$$

Thus, the function $f h_u \eta$ is bounded and measurable. According to [3, Theorem 2.1], we know that for any $x \in E$ and any bounded measurable function g ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x(g(X_t) | T > t) = \int_E g(x) \nu(dx).$$

So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}) | T > t) &\geq \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{e^{\lambda qt} \mathbb{E}_x[f(X_{qt}) h_u(X_{qt}) \eta(X_{qt}) \mathbf{1}_{\{T > qt\}}]}{e^{\lambda t} \mathbb{P}_x(T > t)} \\ &= \int_E f(x) h_u(x) \eta(x) \nu(dx). \end{aligned}$$

Based on the monotone convergence theorem, by letting $u \rightarrow \infty$ in the above formula, we have

$$\liminf_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}) | T > t) \geq \int_E f(x) m(dx). \quad (2.2)$$

On the other hand, since f is bounded, we can repeat the argument, replacing f by $\|f\|_\infty - f$, which gives

$$\limsup_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}) | T > t) \leq \int_E f(x) m(dx). \quad (2.3)$$

Combining (2.2) and (2.3), for positive and bounded function f , we have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x(f(X_{qt}) | T > t) = \int_E f(x) m(dx). \quad (2.4)$$

For (2.4), we can extend it to arbitrary bounded f by subtraction.

Finally, by change of variable in the Lebesgue integral and the dominated convergence theorem, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left(\frac{1}{t} \int_0^t f(X_s) ds | T > t \right) &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_x \left(\int_0^1 f(X_{qt}) dq | T > t \right) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}_x (f(X_{qt}) | T > t) dq \\ &= \int_E f(x) m(dx). \end{aligned}$$

The uniqueness of m is due to the uniqueness of ν . Thus, we have proved that there exists a unique quasi-ergodic distribution for X . In particular, m coincides with the unique stationary distribution of the h -process (see [3, Theorem 3.1])

(ii) Let us remark that

$$\mathbb{P}_x(T > t) \leq \mathbb{P}_y(T > t) \quad \text{for } x \leq y.$$

Thus, from (2.1), it is easy to see that

$$\eta(x) \leq \eta(y).$$

So $(m(x)/\nu(x), x \in E)$ is increasing. This ends the proof of the theorem. $\square$

3 Birth-death processes

3.1 Quasi-ergodic distributions for the birth-death process

Let $X = (X_t, t \geq 0)$ be a continuous-time birth-death process taking values in $\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$, where 0 is an absorbing state and $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$ is an irreducible transient class. Its jump rate matrix $Q := (q_{ij}, i, j \in \mathbb{N})$ satisfies

$$q_{ij} = \begin{cases} b_i & \text{if } j = i + 1, i \geq 0, \\ d_i & \text{if } j = i - 1, i \geq 1, \\ -(b_i + d_i) & \text{if } j = i, i \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where the birth rates $(b_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ and death rates $(d_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ are strictly positive, and $d_0 = b_0 = 0$.

Define the potential coefficients $\pi = (\pi_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ by

$$\pi_1 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_i = \frac{b_1 b_2 \cdots b_{i-1}}{d_2 d_3 \cdots d_i}, \quad i \geq 2. \quad (3.1)$$

Then, we have $b_i\pi_i = d_{i+1}\pi_{i+1}$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Put

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i\pi_i}, \quad B = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \pi_i, \quad R = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=1}^i \pi_j, \quad S = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j. \quad (3.2)$$

We observe that

$$R + S = AB, \quad A = \infty \Rightarrow R = \infty, \quad S < \infty \Rightarrow B < \infty.$$

If absorption at 0 is certain which means that $\mathbb{P}_i(T < \infty) = 1$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$, where $T = \inf\{t \geq 0 : X_t = 0\}$ is the absorption time of X , then it is equivalent to assuming $A = \infty$ (see [12]). Therefore, $A = \infty$ implies the process X is non-explosive.

We write $P_{ij}(t) = \mathbb{P}_i(X_t = j)$. It is well known (see, e.g., [1, Theorem 5.1.9]) that under our assumptions, there exists a parameter $\lambda \geq 0$, called the decay parameter of X , such that

$$\lambda = - \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{t} \log P_{ij}(t), \quad i, j \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.3)$$

In [18, Theorem 3.2], van Doorn proved that: (i) $\lambda > 0$ and there is a unique quasi-stationary distribution for the process X with 0 as an absorbing state and ∞ as an entrance boundary (i.e., $R = \infty, S < \infty$); (ii) when ∞ is a natural boundary (i.e., $R = \infty, S = \infty$), then either $\lambda > 0$ and there is an infinite continuum of quasi-stationary distributions, or $\lambda = 0$ and there is no quasi-stationary distribution.

Let $(Q_i(x), i \geq 0)$ be the birth-death polynomials, given as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_0(x) &= 0, \\ Q_1(x) &= 1, \\ b_i Q_{i+1}(x) - (b_i + d_i) Q_i(x) + d_i Q_{i-1}(x) &= -x Q_i(x), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

It is well known (see, e.g., [6]) that $Q_i(x)$ has $i-1$ positive, simple zeros, x_{ij} ($j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1$), which verify the interlacing property

$$0 < x_{i+1,j} < x_{i,j} < x_{i+1,j+1}, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, i-1, \quad i \geq 2. \quad (3.5)$$

Therefore, the following limits

$$\xi_j \equiv \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} x_{ij}, \quad j \geq 1, \quad (3.6)$$

exist and satisfy $0 \leq \xi_j \leq \xi_{j+1} < \infty$. It is easy to see from (3.4) that, as a result,

$$x \leq \xi_1 \Leftrightarrow Q_i(x) > 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.7)$$

When $A = \infty$ and $S < \infty$, we have $0 < \lambda = \xi_1 < \xi_2 < \dots$ with $\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \xi_j = \infty$.

Of importance to us in the proof of our main results will be the process X conditioned to never be absorbed, usually referred to as the h -process. Let $\bar{P}_{ij}(t) = \mathbb{P}_i(Y_t = j)$ be transition

kernel of the h -process $Y = (Y_t, t \geq 0)$. From [10], we know that $\bar{P}_{ii}(t) = e^{\lambda t} P_{ii}(t)$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus, the λ -classification of the killed process X^T can be presented in the following form. If Y is positive recurrent (resp. recurrent, null recurrent, transient), then the killed process X^T is said to be λ -positive (resp. λ -recurrent, λ -null, λ -transient).

For the birth-death process, we have the following result. In addition, we point out that quasi-ergodic distributions of the birth-death process with ∞ a natural boundary can be obtained by employing the work of Schoutens [17] on doubly limiting conditional distributions and a result of Flaspohler [8]. But to make use of the result of Flaspohler [8], it needs to assume that the process is λ -positive, which, in general, is not easy to check. Note that if absorption at 0 is certain, then $S < \infty$ is equivalent to Assumption (A) (see [3, Theorem 4.1]). Thus, the main result is illustrated on the birth-death process.

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a birth-death process for which 0 is an absorbing state and ∞ is an entrance boundary. Then there exists a unique quasi-ergodic distribution $m = (m_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ for X , where*

$$m_i = \frac{\pi_i Q_i^2(\lambda)}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j Q_j^2(\lambda)}.$$

In particular, m is just the unique stationary distribution of the h -process. Moreover, $\nu \lesssim m$, where ν is the unique quasi-stationary distribution of X .

Proof. (i) We first prove that the h -process Y is strongly ergodic. According to [7, Proposition 5.9]), the process Y , whose law starting from $i \in \mathbb{N}$ is given by

$$\mathbb{P}_i(Y_{s_1} = i_1, \dots, Y_{s_k} = i_k) := \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_i(X_{s_1} = i_1, \dots, X_{s_k} = i_k | T > t),$$

is a Markov chain with transition kernel

$$\forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \mathbb{P}_i(Y_s = j) = e^{\lambda s} \frac{Q_j(\lambda)}{Q_i(\lambda)} \mathbb{P}_i(X_s = j). \quad (3.8)$$

From (3.8), we get that Y is still a birth-death process taking values in $\mathbb{N}$, and its birth and death parameters are given respectively by

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \bar{b}_i = \frac{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)}{Q_i(\lambda)} b_i,$$

$$\forall i \in \mathbb{N}: \quad \bar{d}_i = \frac{Q_{i-1}(\lambda)}{Q_i(\lambda)} d_i.$$

So we can compute the potential coefficients $\bar{\pi} = (\bar{\pi}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ analogous to (3.1): $\bar{\pi}_1 = 1$ and

$$\bar{\pi}_i = \frac{\bar{b}_1 \bar{b}_2 \cdots \bar{b}_{i-1}}{\bar{d}_2 \bar{d}_3 \cdots \bar{d}_i} = Q_i^2(\lambda) \pi_i, \quad i \geq 2.$$

Similarly, we can compute the constants $\overline{A}, \overline{B}, \overline{R}, \overline{S}$ analogous to (3.2):

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{A} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)Q_i(\lambda)b_i\pi_i}, \quad \overline{B} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Q_i^2(\lambda)\pi_i, \\ \overline{R} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)Q_i(\lambda)b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=1}^i Q_j^2(\lambda)\pi_j, \quad \overline{S} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)Q_i(\lambda)b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} Q_j^2(\lambda)\pi_j.\end{aligned}$$

From (3.4), we have

$$b_i(Q_{i+1}(\lambda) - Q_i(\lambda)) + d_i(Q_{i-1}(\lambda) - Q_i(\lambda)) = -\lambda Q_i(\lambda). \quad (3.9)$$

Multiplying both sides of (3.9) by π_i , and then sum of i from 1 to k , we get

$$b_k\pi_k(Q_{k+1}(\lambda) - Q_k(\lambda)) - d_1\pi_1Q_1(\lambda) = -\lambda \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i Q_i(\lambda).$$

Note that $Q_1(\lambda) = 1$, $\pi_1 = 1$ and $\lambda \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i Q_i(\lambda) = d_1$ by (3.10) below. Then

$$Q_{k+1}(\lambda) - Q_k(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{b_k\pi_k} \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \pi_i Q_i(\lambda) > 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Therefore, $Q_i(\lambda)$ is strictly increasing with $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and has the minimum 1. Also, we know from [9, Lemma 3.4] that $Q_i(\lambda)$ is bounded, denoted by W an upper bound. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{R} &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)Q_i(\lambda)b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=1}^i \pi_j \geq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{W^2 b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=1}^i \pi_j = \frac{1}{W^2} R = \infty, \\ \overline{S} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{Q_{i+1}(\lambda)Q_i(\lambda)b_i\pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} W^2 \pi_j \leq W^2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j = W^2 S < \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Note that 1 is a reflecting boundary for Y . Hence, we know from [14, Theorem 3.1] that the process Y is strongly ergodic, which implies the killed process X^T is λ -positive recurrent. Thus, it is well known that there exists a unique stationary distribution $(\frac{\pi_i Q_i^2(\lambda)}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j Q_j^2(\lambda)}, i \in \mathbb{N})$ for Y . From [18], we know that $Q(\lambda) := (Q_i(\lambda), i \in \mathbb{N})$ is a λ -invariant function for Q , that is, $QQ(\lambda) = -\lambda Q(\lambda)$, and the process X admits $\nu = (\nu_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ as the unique quasi-stationary distribution, where

$$\nu_i = \frac{\pi_i Q_i(\lambda)}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j Q_j(\lambda)} = \frac{\lambda}{d_1} \pi_i Q_i(\lambda). \quad (3.10)$$

This implies that the series $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_i Q_i(\lambda)$ is summable and $\theta = (\theta_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is the unique λ -invariant measure for Q , where $\theta_i = \pi_i Q_i(\lambda)$, that is, $\theta Q = -\lambda \theta$. Hence, from [2, Theorem 1], we know that there exists a unique quasi-ergodic distribution m for the process X .

(ii) Notice that

$$\frac{m_i}{\nu_i} = \frac{\frac{\pi_i Q_i^2(\lambda)}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j Q_j^2(\lambda)}}{\frac{\lambda}{d_1} \pi_i Q_i(\lambda)} = \frac{Q_i(\lambda)}{\frac{\lambda}{d_1} B},$$

and furthermore, from the proof of the above result, we know that $Q_i(\lambda)$ is increasing with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, so $(m_i/\nu_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is increasing. Thus, the result follows. $\square$

3.2 A remark on eigentime identity for the birth-death process with exit boundary

Let $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{X}_t, t \geq 0)$ be a continuous-time birth-death process taking values on $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ with birth rates $\tilde{b}_i > 0$ ($i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$) and death rates $\tilde{d}_i > 0$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$). Define the potential coefficients to be $\tilde{\pi}_0 = 1, \tilde{\pi}_i = \tilde{b}_0 \tilde{b}_1 \cdots \tilde{b}_{i-1} / \tilde{d}_1 \tilde{d}_2 \cdots \tilde{d}_i$ ($i \in \mathbb{N}$). Set

$$\tilde{A} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{\pi}_i}, \quad \tilde{B} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}_i, \quad \tilde{R} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{\pi}_i} \sum_{j=0}^i \tilde{\pi}_j, \quad \tilde{S} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{b}_i \tilde{\pi}_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}_j. \quad (3.11)$$

According to [1, Chapter 8], when $\tilde{R} < \infty$, the corresponding $\tilde{Q}$ -process is not unique. Due to this reason, we consider here only the minimal birth-death process. Suppose that $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{X}_t, t \geq 0)$ is the minimal birth-death process. From [1, Chapter 8], we also know that $\tilde{R}$ is the expectation of first passage time of X from 0 to ∞ .

The following result is obtained essentially by Mao [15]. Here, we give an alternative proof for it.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $\tilde{X}$ be the minimal birth-death process for which 0 is a reflecting boundary (i.e., $\tilde{d}_0 = 0$) and ∞ is an exit boundary (i.e., $\tilde{R} < \infty, \tilde{S} = \infty$). Then the eigentime identity reads as*

$$\tilde{R} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\tilde{\xi}_i},$$

where $(\tilde{\xi}_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is the eigenvalue of infinitesimal generator of $\tilde{X}$.

Remark 3.1. *We point out that the study of eigentime identity for the minimal birth-death process $\tilde{X}$ with 0 an absorbing boundary and ∞ an exit boundary, can be transformed into the present case via a Doob's h -transform; see [9] for details.*

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Using a duality method, we can transfer $\tilde{X}$ to X , where X is defined in Subsection 3.1. In fact, it will be seen from the following definition:

$$d_0 = 0; \quad b_i = \tilde{d}_i, \quad d_{i+1} = \tilde{b}_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{Z}_+.$$

Straightforward calculations show that

$$\pi_i = \tilde{b}_0 \frac{1}{\tilde{d}_i \tilde{\pi}_i}, \quad \frac{1}{b_i \pi_i} = \frac{1}{\tilde{b}_0} \tilde{\pi}_i, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}; \quad (3.12)$$

$$A = \frac{1}{\tilde{b}_0}(\tilde{B} - 1), \quad B = \tilde{b}_0 \tilde{A}, \quad R = \tilde{S}, \quad S = \tilde{R} - \tilde{A}. \quad (3.13)$$

According to the proof of [7, Theorem 5.4], we know that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\xi_i} = \frac{1}{d_1} B + S.$$

Since $\tilde{\xi}_i = \xi_i$, for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ (see, e.g., [9, Proposition 3.1]), from (3.13) we get the conclusion. $\square$

The following result may be useful to study the existence of quasi-ergodic distributions for the birth-death process with exit boundary. We also point out that such an equality is a necessary and sufficient condition for some absorbing birth-death processes to be λ -positive (see [19, Theorem 5.2]).

Proposition 3.1. *Let $\tilde{X}$ be the minimal birth-death process for which 0 is a reflecting boundary and ∞ is an exit boundary. Then we have*

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}_i \tilde{Q}_i^2(\lambda) < \infty,$$

where $(\tilde{Q}_i(\lambda), i \in \mathbb{Z}_+)$ is analogous to (3.4).

Proof. By a direct calculation, we have

$$\tilde{Q}_i(x) = 1 - \frac{x}{\tilde{b}_0} \sum_{j=1}^i \pi_j Q_j(x), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.14)$$

So from (3.14), we can see that $\tilde{Q}_i(\lambda) \in [0, 1]$. By (3.10), (3.12) and (3.14), we get

$$\tilde{\pi}_i \tilde{Q}_i(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j Q_j(\lambda), \quad i \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (3.15)$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\pi}_i \tilde{Q}_i^2(\lambda) &= \left(\frac{\lambda}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j Q_j(\lambda) \right) \tilde{Q}_i(\lambda) \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j Q_j(\lambda) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{\lambda W}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j, \quad i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\pi}_i \tilde{Q}_i^2(\lambda) \leq 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda W}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j = 1 + \lambda W S < \infty,$$

where with the convention that $\tilde{Q}_0(\lambda) \equiv 1$. This completes the proof. $\square$

4 An example

Set $d_0 = b_0 = 0; b_i = i + 3, d_i = (i + 1)^2, i \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\pi_1 = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_i &= \frac{2(i+2)}{3(i+1)!}, \\ A &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i \pi_i} = \frac{3}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(i+1)!}{(i+3)(i+2)} = \infty, \\ S &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{b_i \pi_i} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \pi_j = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{(i+1)!}{(i+3)(i+2)} \sum_{j=i+1}^{\infty} \frac{(j+2)}{(j+1)!} < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the decay parameter $\lambda = 2$ and the corresponding eigenfunction is $Q_i(\lambda) = \frac{i}{i+2}$ (see [9, Example 5.1]). From [18, Theorem 3.2], we know that there exists a unique quasi-stationary distribution $\nu = (\nu_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ for the birth-death process X , where $\nu_i = \frac{i}{(i+1)!}$. By Theorem 3.1, we know that $m = (m_i, i \in \mathbb{N})$ is the unique quasi-ergodic distribution for X , where

$$m_i = \frac{\pi_i Q_i^2(\lambda)}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \pi_j Q_j^2(\lambda)} = \frac{\frac{i^2}{(i+2)(i+1)!}}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{j^2}{(j+2)(j+1)!}}.$$

Further, it is easy to check that

$$\frac{m_i}{\nu_i} = \frac{\frac{i}{i+2}}{\sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{j^2}{(j+2)(j+1)!}}$$

is increasing with $i \in \mathbb{N}$, which implies $\nu \lesssim m$. Thus, this example illustrates our results.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Hunan Provincial Innovation Foundation For Postgraduate (Grant No. CX2015B203) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No.11371301).

References

- [1] Anderson, W. J. (1991). *Continuous-Time Markov Chains*. Springer, New York.
- [2] Breyer, L. A. and Roberts, G. O. (1999). A quasi-ergodic theorem for evanescent processes. *Stochastic Processes Appl.* **84**, 177–186.
- [3] Champagnat, N. and Villemonais, D. (2016). Exponential convergence to quasi-stationary distribution and Q -process. *Probab. Theory Related Fields.* **164**, 243–283.
- [4] Chen, J. and Deng, X. (2013). Large deviations and related problems for absorbing Markov chains. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **123**, 2398–2418.
- [5] Chen, J., Li, H. and Jian, S. (2012). Some limit theorems for absorbing Markov processes. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 345003 (11pp).
- [6] Chihara, T. S. (1978). *An Introduction to Orthogonal Polynomials*. Gordon and Breach, New York.
- [7] Collet, P., Martínez, S. and San Martín, J. (2013). *Quasi-Stationary Distributions*. Probab. Appl. (N. Y.), Springer, Heidelberg.
- [8] Flaspohler, D. C. (1974). Quasi-stationary distributions for absorbing continuous-time denumerable Markov chains. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **26**, 351–356.
- [9] Gao, W.-J. and Mao, Y.-H. (2015). Quasi-stationary distribution for the birth-death process with exit boundary. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **427**, 114–125.
- [10] Hart, A., Martínez, S. and San Martín, J. (2003). The λ -classification of continuous-time birth-and-death process. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **35**, 1111–1130.
- [11] He, G. and Zhang, H. (2016). On quasi-ergodic distribution for one-dimensional diffusions. *Statist. Probab. Lett.* **110**, 175–180.
- [12] Karlin, S. and McGregor, J. L. (1957a). The classification of birth and death processes. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **86**, 366–400.
- [13] Karlin, S. and McGregor, J. L. (1957b). The differential equations of birth-and-death processes, and the Stieltjes moment problem. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **85**, 489–546.
- [14] Mao, Y.-H. (2002). Strong ergodicity for Markov processes by coupling methods. *J. Appl. Probab.* **39**, 839–852.
- [15] Mao, Y.-H. (2006). Eigentime identity for transient Markov chains. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **315**, 415–424.

- [16] Méléard, S. and Villemonais, D. (2012). Quasi-stationary distributions and population processes. *Probab. Surv.* **9**, 340–410.
- [17] Schoutens, W. (2000). Birth and death processes, orthogonal polynomials and limiting conditional distributions. *Math. Sci.* **25**, 87–93.
- [18] Van Doorn, E. A. (1991). Quasi-stationary distributions and convergence to quasi-stationarity of birth-death processes. *Adv. in Appl. Probab.* **23**, 683–700.
- [19] Van Doorn, E. A. (2003). Birth-death processes and associated polynomials. *J. Comput. Appl. Math.* **153**, 497–506.
- [20] Van Doorn, E. A. and Pollett, P. K. (2013). Quasi-stationary distributions for discrete-state models. *European J. Oper. Res.* **230**, 1–14.
- [21] Whitt, W. (1985). The renewal-process stationary-excess operator. *J. Appl. Probab.* **22**, 156–167.
- [22] Zhang, J., Li, S. and Song, R. (2014). Quasi-stationarity and quasi-ergodicity of general Markov processes. *Sci. China. Math.* **57**, 2013–2024.